

From: Vaidya, Bhalthandra
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2013 2:01 PM
To: 'Dosa, John J'; 'Darling, Theresa H'; 'Vandeputte, Dennis E'
Cc: Hoffman, Keith; Lupold, Timothy; Lupold, Timothy; Meighan, Sean
Subject: Acceptance Review- Acceptance of MF1316 & MF1317, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Request to Use a Later ASME Code Edition and Addenda

Subject: Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Docket Nos. 50-220 and 50-410
American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code, Section XI, Inservice
Inspection Program - Request to Use a Later ASME Code Edition and Addenda
(TAC Nos. MF1316 & MF1317)

By letter dated March 26, Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, LLC, submitted a relief request for [Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2. The proposed relief request is to use a later Edition and Addenda of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, Section XI, for Examination Categories B-L-1, B-M-1, and C-G. The request applies to the Nine Mile Point Unit 1 fourth ten-year inservice inspection (ISI) interval and to the Nine Mile Point Unit 2 third ten-year ISI interval. The purpose of this letter is to provide the results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's acceptance review of this [amendment/relief] request. The acceptance review was performed to determine if there is sufficient technical information in scope and depth to allow the NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review. The acceptance review is also intended to identify whether the application has any readily apparent information insufficiencies in its characterization of the regulatory requirements or the licensing basis of the plant.

Pursuant to Sections 50.55a(a)(3)(i) and 50.55a(a)(3)(ii) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed alternatives would provide an acceptable level of quality and safety, or that compliance with the specified requirements of Section 50.55a would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality or safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed your application and concluded that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed amendment in terms of regulatory requirements and the protection of public health and safety and the environment. Given the lesser scope and depth of the acceptance review as compared to the detailed technical review, there may be instances in which issues that impact the NRC staff's ability to complete the detailed technical review are identified despite completion of an adequate acceptance review. You will be advised of any further information needed to support the NRC staff's detailed technical review by separate correspondence.

If you have any questions, please contact me, at (301) 415-3308.

Bhalthandra K. Vaidya
Licensing Project Manager
NRC/NRR/DORL/LPL1-1
(301)-415-3308 (O)
bhalthandra.vaidya@nrc.gov